

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
LITTLE ROCK DIVISION**

MICHAEL JAMES HUFFMAN *et al.*

PLAINTIFFS

V.

4:14CV00088 SWW/HDY

BRIAN BRADSHAW *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS

The following recommended disposition has been sent to United States District Judge Susan W. Wright. Any party may serve and file written objections to this recommendation. Objections should be specific and should include the factual or legal basis for the objection. If the objection is to a factual finding, specifically identify that finding and the evidence that supports your objection. An original and one copy of your objections must be received in the office of the United States District Court Clerk no later than fourteen (14) days from the date of the findings and recommendations. The copy will be furnished to the opposing party. Failure to file timely objections may result in waiver of the right to appeal questions of fact.

If you are objecting to the recommendation and also desire to submit new, different, or additional evidence, and to have a hearing for this purpose before the District Judge, you must, at the same time that you file your written objections, include the following:

1. Why the record made before the Magistrate Judge is inadequate.
2. Why the evidence proffered at the hearing before the District Judge (if such a hearing is granted) was not offered at the hearing before the Magistrate Judge.
3. The detail of any testimony desired to be introduced at the

hearing before the District Judge in the form of an offer of proof, and a copy, or the original, of any documentary or other non-testimonial evidence desired to be introduced at the hearing before the District Judge.

From this submission, the District Judge will determine the necessity for an additional evidentiary hearing, either before the Magistrate Judge or before the District Judge.

Mail your objections and “Statement of Necessity” to:

Clerk, United States District Court
Eastern District of Arkansas
600 West Capitol Avenue, Suite A149
Little Rock, AR 72201-3325

DISPOSITION


Plaintiff Michael James Huffman filed a *pro se* complaint on February 13, 2014.¹ When mail sent to Plaintiff’s address of record was returned as undeliverable, the Court entered an order on April 7, 2014, directing him to provide his current mailing address within 30 days, and warned him that his failure to do so would result in the recommended dismissal of his complaint (docket entry #12). More than 30 days have passed, and Plaintiff has not provided his updated address or otherwise responded to the order, and mail sent to his address of record continues to be returned (docket entries #13 & #16-#17). Under these circumstances, the Court concludes that Plaintiff’s complaint should be dismissed for failure to comply with Local Rule 5.5(c)(2), and for failure to respond to the Court’s order. *See Miller v. Benson*, 51 F.3d 166, 168 (8th Cir. 1995) (District courts have inherent power to dismiss *sua sponte* a case for failure to prosecute, and exercise of that power is reviewed for abuse of discretion).

¹Jeremy Ruff was also initially listed as a Plaintiff, but Ruff’s claims were dismissed without prejudice on April 15, 2014 (docket entry #14).

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Plaintiff's complaint be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to comply with Local Rule 5.5(c)(2), and for failure to respond to the Court's order.
2. The Court certify that an *in forma pauperis* appeal taken from the order and judgment dismissing this action is considered frivolous and not in good faith.

DATED this 16 day of May, 2014.



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE